REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject Application. This communication is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the 1/09/06 Office Action.

Applicant notes that a telephone conversation occurred between Applicant's Attorney and Examiner Harper on 2/2/06 in which the Examiner indicated that upon further review claims 21 and 23 recite allowable subject matter. Applicant appreciates the Office's indication of allowable subject matter.

Rejections

§103

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 19-33, and 41-71 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0233349 to Stern et al (hereinafter "Stern") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0195863 to Marsh (hereinafter "Marsh").

Claims 3 and 5-10 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0233349 to Stern et al (hereinafter "Stern") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0195863 to Marsh (hereinafter "Marsh") and further in view of Music Match User Guide.

Claim 4 is rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0233349 to Stern et al (hereinafter "Stern") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0195863 to Marsh (hereinafter "Marsh") and further in view of Softpointer.com.

Claims 13-18 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0233349 to Stern et al (hereinafter "Stern") in view of

2.5

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0195863 to Marsh (hereinafter "Marsh") and further in view of Music Match User Guide and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0175159 to Oetzel.

Claims 34-40 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0233349 to Stern et al (hereinafter "Stern") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0195863 to Marsh (hereinafter "Marsh") and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0175159 to Oetzel.

Applicant respectfully notes that both Stern and Marsh fall under the §103(c) exception and are disqualified as prior art. Accordingly, neither Stern nor Marsh can be utilized as a basis for rejecting claims of the present application.

Stern is a Patent Publication filed on June 14th, 2002 and published on December 18th, 2003. Marsh is a Patent Publication filed April 16th, 2002 and published on October 16th, 2003. The present application was filed on June 26th, 2003, which is prior to the publication of either Stern or Marsh. Accordingly, if Stern and Marsh constitute prior art relative to the present application it must be under §102(e) which states:

(e) the invention was described in - (1) an <u>application for patent</u>, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

The Office makes a §103(a) rejection based upon Stern and Marsh, however, the Office apparently overlooked §103(c) which states:

(c)
(1) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section

LEE & HAYES, PLLC 19 of 21

102 of this title, <u>shall not preclude patentability</u> under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person <u>or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person</u>.

The term common ownership is further defined in MPEP § which states:

The term "commonly owned" is intended to mean that the subject matter which would otherwise be prior art to the claimed invention and the claimed invention are entirely or wholly owned by the same person(s) or organization(s)/business entity(ies) at the time the claimed invention was made. If the person(s) or organization(s) owned less than 100 percent of the subject matter which would otherwise be prior art to the claimed invention, or less than 100 percent of the claimed invention, then common ownership would not exist. Common ownership requires that the person(s) or organization(s)/business entity(ies) own 100 percent of the subject matter and 100 percent of the claimed invention.

The present Application was and is 100% assigned to Microsoft Corporation. Both Stern and Marsh were subject to an obligation of assignment to Microsoft Corp. of 100% interest at the time of filing of the present application. In support of this position, Applicant includes with this communication, a copy of the Patent Assignment Abstract of Title for Stern and a copy of the Patent Assignment for Marsh. (Applicant can further obtain a copy of Stearn's Patent Assignment should the presently submitted USPTO document be deemed insufficient.) Based on the above provided facts and citations, Applicant respectfully submits that both Stern and Marsh are disqualified as prior art relative to the Present Application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection based upon Stern and Marsh be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the art of record fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 1-71.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the above pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the present Application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the Application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC 421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500 Spokane, WA 99201

Dated 2/27/0C

Paul W. Mitchell Reg. No. 44,453

(509) 324-9256 ext. 237



United States Patent and Trademark Office

Home | Site Index | Search | Guides | Contacts | eBusiness | eBiz alerts | News | Help



Assignments on the Web > Patent Query

Patent Assignment Abstract of Title

NOTE: Results display only for issued patents and published applications. For pending or abandoned applications please consult USPTO staff.

Total Assignments: 1

Patent #: NONE

Issue Dt:

Application #: 10173291 Filing Dt: 06/14/2002

Publication #: <u>US20030233349</u> **Pub Dt:** 12/18/2003

Inventors: Denise Stern, Melissa A. Bohm, Martina Hiemstra, Umachandra Chikkareddy et al

Title: Media player system

Assignment: 1

Reel/Frame: 013016/0920

Recorded: 06/14/2002

Pages: 4

Conveyance: ASSIGNMENT OF ASSIGNORS INTEREST (SEE DOCUMENT FOR DETAILS).

Assignors: STERN, DENISE

Exec Dt: 06/14/2002

BOHM, MELISSA A.

Exec Dt: 06/14/2002

HIEMSTRA, MARTINA

Exec Dt: 06/14/2002

CHIKKAREDDY, UMACHANDRA

Exec Dt: 06/14/2002

HANSEN, JAMES S.

Exec Dt: 06/14/2002

Assignee: MICROSOFT CORPORATION

ONE MICROSOFT WAY

REDMOND, WASHINGTON 98052

Correspondent: CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON ET AL.

BARBARA M. LEVEL, ESQ. 1420 FIFTH AVENUE

SUITE 2800

SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

Search Results as of: 02/20/2006 03:10 PI

If you have any comments or questions concerning the data displayed, contact OPR / Assignments at 571-272-3350

| .HOME | INDEX | SEARCH | eBUSINESS | CONTACT US | PRIVACY STATEMENT